

APPENDIX III.

QUESTIONS TO WHICH PRINTED ANSWERS WERE
FURNISHED, BUT WHICH WERE NOT TAKEN
UP FOR DISCUSSION.

MR. S. I. MUMTAZ (Channapatna Municipality).—

Q.—I. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) (i) Whether they are aware of the fact that the Special Officer, Channapatna, did not attend the Municipal Office and work since 1st December 1932; (ii) whether he has admitted the fact before the Sub-Division Officer, Closepet, and the Channapatna Municipal President and Vice-President on 21st February 1933; (iii) if so, what steps were taken?

(b) (i) Whether the absence, irregularities, negligence of duty, etc., of the Special Officer were brought to the notice of the President by the Vice-President; (ii) if so, what were the steps taken by the President?

(c) Whether the fact of his not attending to municipal work was reported to the Deputy Commissioner, soliciting instructions regarding the disbursement of his pay, etc.; if so, what are the steps taken?

(d) What was the cause assigned by the Special Officer to the Sub-Division Officer for his not attending to his municipal duties?

(e) During the month of February 1933, on how many occasions and for how many days was the Special Officer on leave; for how many days was he absent and on how many days was he actually present on duty?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT.—

A.—I. (a) (i) No.

(ii) No.

(iii) *Vide* answer to (a) (ii).

(b) (i) The Vice-President brought to the notice of the President once that the Special Officer was not on duty. The President found on enquiry, that the Special Officer had obtained leave for his absence.

(ii) Does not arise.

APPENDIX III—*contd.*

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise in view of answer to clause (b) (i).

(e) The Special Officer took leave on three occasions for 13 days. He was absent on the days he was on leave, and on other days in the month he was on duty.

MESSRS. V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna Taluk) and **R. SUBBA RAO** (Anekal Taluk).—

Q.—4. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) On how many occasions from January 1926 to January 1933 disputes arose between capitalists and labourers in Bangalore, Mysore, the Kolar Gold Fields and other places in the State, resulting in strikes?

(b) On how many occasions did the police interfere and fire on the labourers; how many were killed and how many wounded?

(c) On how many occasions were the Government compelled to call the aid of the Military to deal with the disturbances?

(d) How many complaints were filed by the police against labourers in Bangalore and their sympathisers from 1926 to January 1933?

(e) In what cases, were accused persons convicted and how many; in how many, were accused acquitted or discharged?

(f) How many cases were dismissed?

(g) In the cases filed from January 1926 to January 1933 against labourers and their sympathisers by the Bangalore Police, what is the percentage of cases in which the police were successful?

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—4. (a) Except in Bangalore City and the Kolar Gold Fields, there were no disputes of the kind during the period.

Bangalore City 16 occasions.

Kolar Gold Fields 4 occasions.

(b) Bangalore City Police had to interfere on eight occasions.

Fire was opened on two occasions once on 20th July 1926 and again on 18th July 1931. Four died and two